arXiv:0810.2570v1 [math.CV] 14 Oct 2008

GEOMETRIC PROPERTIES AND RELATED RESULTS FOR HOLOMORPHIC SEGRE PRESERVING MAPS

R. BLAIR ANGLE

Abstract. In this paper, we examine holomorphic Segre preserving maps between the complexifications of real hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. In particular, we find several sufficient conditions ensuring that Segre transversality and total Segre nondegeneracy of the maps must hold.

1. Introduction

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a real analytic hypersurface, with $p \in M$, given locally near p by the real analytic defining function $\rho(Z, \bar{Z})$. The *complexification* $\mathcal{M}$ of M is a holomorphic hypersurface of $\mathbb{C}^{2n+2}$ given locally for $(Z, \zeta) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ near $(p, \bar{p})$ by $\mathcal{M} = \{(Z, \zeta) : \rho(Z, \zeta) = 0\}$. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be an open neighborhood of p such that $\mathcal{M}$ is defined on $\Omega \times {}^*\Omega$, where ${}^*\Omega := \{\bar{Z} : Z \in \Omega\}$. Given any $(Z, \zeta) \in \Omega \times {}^*\Omega$, the *Segre varieties* Σ_Z and $\hat{\Sigma}_\zeta$ of M are given by $\Sigma_Z := \{\zeta \in {}^*\Omega : \rho(Z, \zeta) = 0\}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_\zeta := \{Z \in \Omega : \rho(Z, \zeta) = 0\}$. For (Z', ζ') coordinates on $\mathbb{C}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, let $M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a real analytic hypersurface, with $p' \in M'$, and denote its complexification by $\mathcal{M}'$ and its Segre varieties by $\Sigma'_{Z'}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}'_{\zeta'}$. Let $\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{C}^{2n+2} \to \mathbb{C}^{2n+2}$ be a holomorphic map defined near $(p, \bar{p})$ sending $(\mathcal{M}, (p, \bar{p}))$ into $(\mathcal{M}', (p', \bar{p}'))$. Furthermore, we will assume that for any $(Z, \zeta) \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists $(Z', \zeta') \in \mathcal{M}'$ such that $\mathcal{H}\big(\{Z\} \times \Sigma_Z\big) \subseteq \{Z'\} \times \Sigma'_{Z'}$ and $\mathcal{H}\big(\hat{\Sigma}_\zeta \times \{\zeta\}\big) \subseteq \hat{\Sigma}'_{\zeta'} \times \{\zeta'\}$. We claim that $\mathcal{H}$, when restricted to $\mathcal{M}$, is a map of the form

$$\mathcal{H}(Z, \zeta) = (H(Z), \widetilde{H}(\zeta)),$$

where $H, \widetilde{H} : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. This fact was proven for hypersurfaces in [6], but it is true for *generic* submanifolds of higher codimension as well (see [1], [2]).

We will call such a map a *holomorphic Segre preserving map* (HSPM). Utilizing the notation $\overline{\varphi}(z) := \overline{\varphi(\bar{z})}$, we observe that if $\widetilde{H} = \overline{H}$, then H is a holomorphic map defined near p sending (M, p) into (M', p'). Such maps have been extensively studied. However, HSPMs are relatively new and unstudied objects (for related recent work, see [1], [2], and [10]).

It can be shown (see, for example, [3]) that there exists a holomorphic change of coordinates $Z = (z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}$, vanishing at p, and an open neighborhood Ω of 0 such that in these coordinates M is locally given by $\{(z, w) \in \Omega : w = Q(z, \bar{z}, \bar{w})\}$, where $Q(z,\chi,\tau)$ is a holomorphic function defined near 0 in $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}$ and satisfying $Q(0,\chi,\tau) \equiv Q(z,0,\tau) \equiv \tau$. Such coordinates are called *normal coordinates.*

We now express several geometric conditions under the assumption that M is given in normal coordinates (for coordinate-independent definitions see, e.g., [1], [3], [8]). We remind the reader that the *generic rank* of a holomorphic map $\varphi(Z)$ is the largest integer r such that there exists an $r \times r$ minor of the matrix $\left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial Z}\right)$ which is not identically 0. We say that M is of *finite type* at 0 (in the sense of Kohn [7] and Bloom and Graham [4]) if and only if $Q(z,\chi,0) \not\equiv 0$. Otherwise, M is said to be of *infinite type* at 0. In addition, we have:

(i) M is *holomorphically nondegenerate* at 0 if and only if there exists an integer K such that the generic rank of the map $(\chi,\tau) \mapsto \big(Q_{z^\alpha}(0,\chi,\tau)\big)_{|\alpha|\le K}$ is $n+1$.
(ii) M is of *class* $\mathcal{C}$ at 0 if and only if there exists an integer K such that the generic rank of the map $\chi \mapsto \big(Q_{z^\alpha}(0,\chi,0)\big)_{|\alpha|\le K}$ is n.
(iii) M is *essentially finite* at 0 if and only if there exists an integer K such that the map $\chi \mapsto \big(Q_{z^\alpha}(0,\chi,0)\big)_{|\alpha|\le K}$ is finite.
(iv) M is *finitely nondegenerate* at 0 if and only if there exists an integer K such that the matrix with rows given by $\big(Q_{\chi_j z^\alpha}(0,0,0)\big)_{|\alpha|\le K}$, $1 \le j \le n$, has rank n.

In [9], Stanton proved that if M is connected and holomorphically nondegenerate at 0, then it is holomorphically nondegenerate everywhere. The above definitions thus imply that finite nondegeneracy at 0 ⇒ essential finiteness at 0 ⇒ class $\mathcal{C}$ at 0 ⇒ holomorphic nondegeneracy. We mention here that the notion of class $\mathcal{C}$ was only recently introduced in 2007 by Lamel and Mir in [8].

For the remainder of this paper, we will assume that $M, M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ are given in normal coordinates by $w = Q(z,\chi,\tau)$ and $w' = Q'(z',\chi',\tau')$, respectively. We will also assume that all HSPMs send $(\mathcal{M},0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}',0)$ and are given in the form

$$\mathcal{H}(z,w,\chi,\tau) = \big(H(z,w),\widetilde{H}(\chi,\tau)\big) = \big(f(z,w),g(z,w),\tilde{f}(\chi,\tau),\tilde{g}(\chi,\tau)\big),$$

where $f = (f^1,\dots,f^n)$ and $\tilde{f} = (\tilde{f}^1,\dots,\tilde{f}^n)$ are $\mathbb{C}^n$-valued holomorphic functions, and g and $\tilde{g}$, called the *transversal* components of $\mathcal{H}$, are $\mathbb{C}$-valued holomorphic functions. We will write $z = (z_1,\dots,z_n)$ and $\chi = (\chi_1,\dots,\chi_n)$ (similarly for z' and χ').

It is easy to see that normality of coordinates implies that $g_w(0) = \tilde{g}_\tau(0)$ (see [1]). We say that $\mathcal{H}$ is *Segre transversal* to $\mathcal{M}'$ at 0 if $g_w(0) = \tilde{g}_\tau(0) \neq 0$ (see [10]). $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be *totally Segre nondegenerate* at 0 if both of the following two conditions hold: $\det\big(f_z(z,0)\big) \not\equiv 0$ and $\det\big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\big) \not\equiv 0$. If only one of these conditions holds, then $\mathcal{H}$ is *partially Segre nondegenerate* at 0. We say that $\mathcal{H}$ is *transversally null* if both $g(z,w) \equiv 0$ and $\tilde{g}(\chi,\tau) \equiv 0$.

Remark 1.1. It is interesting to note that with HSPMs it is not necessarily true that $g \equiv 0 \Leftrightarrow \tilde{g} \equiv 0$, nor is it necessarily true that $\det\big(f_z(z,0)\big) \equiv 0 \Leftrightarrow \det\big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\big) \equiv 0$. For example, let $M, M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^3$ be given by $M = \{\text{Im } w = |z_1|^2\}$ and $M' = \{\text{Im } w' = |z_1'|^2 + |z_2'|^2\}$.

Thus, $\mathcal{M} = \{w - \tau = 2iz_1\chi_1\}$ and $\mathcal{M}' = \{w' - \tau' = 2iz_1'\chi_1' + 2iz_2'\chi_2'\}$. Define

$$\mathcal{H}(z, w, \chi, \tau) = \Big(z_2 + z_1z_2, -z_2, 2wz_2, 2\chi_1, 2\chi_1 + i\tau, 0\Big).$$

Observe that $\mathcal{H}$ sends $(\mathcal{M}, 0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}', 0)$, but $g \not\equiv 0$, $\tilde{g} \equiv 0$, $\det\big(f_z(z, 0)\big) \not\equiv 0$, and $\det\big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi, 0)\big) \equiv 0$.

If M' is of infinite type at 0, then given any $\mathbb{C}^n$-valued holomorphic functions $f(z, w)$ and $\tilde{f}(\chi, \tau)$ defined near 0 and satisfying $f(0) = \tilde{f}(0) = 0$, the HSPM $\mathcal{H}(z, w, \chi, \tau) = \big(f(z, w), 0, \tilde{f}(\chi, \tau), 0\big)$ sends $(\mathcal{M}, 0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}', 0)$. In fact, if M is of finite type at 0, then these are the only possible HSPMs (see Lemma 2.2). What if we insist that M' be of finite type at 0? We have the following result which is a generalization of a result of Ebenfelt and Rothschild ([5]).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $M, M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be real analytic hypersurfaces, with M' of finite type at 0, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be an HSPM sending $(\mathcal{M}, 0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}', 0)$. If $\mathcal{H}$ is totally Segre nondegenerate at 0, then $\mathcal{H}$ is Segre transversal to $\mathcal{M}'$ at 0.*

Ebenfelt and Rothschild ([5]) prove a similar result for holomorphic maps H sending M into M'. The proof of Theorem 1.1 follows their proof almost exactly, with only the obvious modifications ($\bar{z}$ and $\bar{w}$ are replaced by χ and τ, respectively, and $\bar{f}$ and $\bar{g}$ are replaced by $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{g}$, respectively). Thus, we will not present the proof here. (The proof, however, can be found in [1].)

What if we impose conditions on M, rather than M'? The next three theorems address this.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $M, M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be real analytic hypersurfaces, with M holomorphically nondegenerate, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be an HSPM sending $(\mathcal{M}, 0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}', 0)$. Then one of the following two possibilities must hold:*

- (i) *$\mathcal{H}$ is transversally null, and $Q'\Big(f(z, w), \tilde{f}(\chi, \tau), 0\Big) \equiv 0$. That is, $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{2n+2}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}'$.*
- (ii) *$\mathcal{H}$ is a biholomorphism near some $p \in \mathcal{M}$. Furthermore, M' is holomorphically nondegenerate.*

Theorem 1.3. *Let $M, M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be real analytic hypersurfaces, with M of class $\mathcal{C}$ at 0, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be an HSPM sending $(\mathcal{M}, 0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}', 0)$. Then one of the following two possibilities must hold:*

- (i) *$\mathcal{H}$ is transversally null, and $Q'\Big(f(z, w), \tilde{f}(\chi, \tau), 0\Big) \equiv 0$. That is, $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{2n+2}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}'$.*
- (ii) *$\mathcal{H}$ is Segre transversal to $\mathcal{M}'$ at 0 and totally Segre nondegenerate at 0, and $\mathcal{H}$ is a biholomorphism near some $p \in \mathcal{M}$. Furthermore, M' is of class $\mathcal{C}$ at 0.*

Theorem 1.4. *Let $M, M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be real analytic hypersurfaces, with M finitely nondegenerate at 0, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be an HSPM sending $(\mathcal{M}, 0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}', 0)$. Then one of the following two possibilities must hold:*

(i) *$\mathcal{H}$ is transversally null, and* $Q'\Big(f(z,w),\tilde{f}(\chi,\tau),0\Big)\equiv 0$. *That is,* $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}^{2n+2})\subseteq\mathcal{M}'$.

(ii) *$\mathcal{H}$ is Segre transversal to $\mathcal{M}'$ at* 0, $\det\big(f_z(0)\big)\neq 0$, *and* $\det\big(\tilde{f}_\chi(0)\big)\neq 0$. *That is, $\mathcal{H}$ is a biholomorphism near* 0. *Furthermore, M' is finitely nondegenerate at* 0.

Another distinguishing feature of HSPMs is the fact that since $\tilde{f}$ is not necessarily the complex conjugate of f, then the lowest order homogeneous polynomials in the Taylor expansions of $\det\big(f_z(z,0)\big)$ and $\det\big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\big)$ may not agree up to a constant, assuming neither determinant is identically 0 (see Example 3.5). Also, it is possible to have one determinant identically 0, and the other not identically 0 (see Remark 1.1). If M' is finitely nondegenerate at 0, however, we have the following.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $M, M'\subseteq\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be real analytic hypersurfaces with M' finitely nondegenerate at 0, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be an HSPM, totally Segre nondegenerate at 0, sending $(\mathcal{M},0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}',0)$. Assume* $\det\big(f_z(z,0)\big)=\sum_j p_j(z)$ *and* $\det\Big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\Big)=\sum_k q_k(\chi)$, *where p_l and q_l are homogeneous polynomials of degree l. Choose j_0 so that $p_{j_0}(z)\not\equiv 0$, but $p_j(z)\equiv 0$ for $j<j_0$. Similarly, choose k_0 so that $q_{k_0}(z)\not\equiv 0$, but $q_k(z)\equiv 0$ for $k<k_0$. Then $j_0=k_0$, and $p_{j_0}(z)=c\bar{q}_{k_0}(z)$ for some nonzero constant c.*

This result is essentially sharp. Even if M' is essentially finite at 0, we will see an example in Section 3 where the preceding theorem fails. If $M, M'\subseteq\mathbb{C}^2$, however, then we can be even looser with our hypotheses. We have the following.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $M, M'\subseteq\mathbb{C}^2$ be real analytic hypersurfaces, with M' of finite type at 0, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be an HSPM sending $(\mathcal{M},0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}',0)$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *$\mathcal{H}$ is totally Segre nondegenerate at* 0.

(ii) *M is of finite type at 0, and $\mathcal{H}$ is not transversally null.*

(iii) *M is of finite type at 0, and $\mathcal{H}$ is Segre transversal to $\mathcal{M}'$ at* 0.

Furthermore, if these conditions hold, then we also have that the order of vanishing of $f(z,0)$ equals the order of vanishing of $\tilde{f}(\chi,0)$. That is, if the lowest order nonzero term of the Taylor expansion of $f(z,0)$ is cz^r for some nonzero constant c and nonnegative integer r, then the lowest order nonzero term of the Taylor expansion of $\tilde{f}(\chi,0)$ is $\tilde{c}\chi^r$ for some nonzero constant $\tilde{c}$. If, in addition, $M=M'$, then $\mathcal{H}$ is a biholomorphism near 0.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we prove our main results as presented in this section. In Section 3 we provide several examples of hypersurfaces and HSPMs between their complexifications. The purpose of these examples is to illustrate the necessity of the hypotheses of a particular result or to demonstrate that a particular result is essentially sharp.

2. Proofs of main results

2.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Before proving Theorem 1.2, we recall the definition of holomorphic nondegeneracy. A hypersurface $M\subseteq\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ is *holomorphically nondegenerate* at p if there does not exist a germ at p of a nontrivial vector field tangent to M of the form $L = \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} a_j(Z)\frac{\partial}{\partial Z_j}$, where $Z = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_{n+1})$ and each $a_j(Z)$ is a holomorphic function.

Now we prove Theorem 1.2. As $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}'$, there exists a holomorphic function $A(z, w, \chi, \tau)$ defined near 0 such that for all (z, w, χ, τ) sufficiently close to 0,

$$g(z,w) - Q'\big(f(z,w), \tilde{f}(\chi,\tau), \tilde{g}(\chi,\tau)\big) = A(z,w,\chi,\tau)\big(w - Q(z,\chi,\tau)\big). \tag{2.1}$$

If $A(z,w,\chi,\tau) \equiv 0$, then let $\chi = \tau = 0$ in (2.1) to see that $g(z,w) \equiv 0$. Similarly, let $z = w = 0$ to see that $\tilde{g}(\chi,\tau) \equiv 0$. This, in turn, tells us that $Q'\big(f(z,w), \tilde{f}(\chi,\tau), 0\big) \equiv 0$. So we now assume that $A(z,w,\chi,\tau) \not\equiv 0$.

If $\det\big(H_Z(Z)\big) \equiv 0$, where $Z = (z,w)$, then there exist holomorphic functions $r_j(z,w)$ and $s(z,w)$, not all identically 0, such that $Lf^1 \equiv \ldots \equiv Lf^n \equiv Lg \equiv 0$, where

$$L := \sum_{j=1}^{n} r_j(z,w)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} + s(z,w)\frac{\partial}{\partial w}. \tag{2.2}$$

This is true because there exists a nontrivial vector V of meromorphic functions (the field of fractions of holomorphic functions) annihilated by the matrix $\big(H_Z(Z)\big)$. We write each meromorphic function as the quotient of holomorphic functions, and then multiply each component of V by the product of the holomorphic denominators of the meromorphic functions. This gives us L.

As $A \not\equiv 0$, we can rewrite (2.1) as follows:

$$g(z,w) - Q'\big(f(z,w), \tilde{f}(\chi,\tau), \tilde{g}(\chi,\tau)\big) = \widetilde{A}(z,w,\chi,\tau)\big(w - Q(z,\chi,\tau)\big)^m, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\widetilde{A}$ is holomorphic near the origin and not identically zero on $\mathcal{M}$, and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Apply L to (2.3) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \equiv\; & L[\widetilde{A}(z,w,\chi,\tau)]\big(w - Q(z,\chi,\tau)\big)^m \\ & + \widetilde{A}(z,w,\chi,\tau)m\big(w - Q(z,\chi,\tau)\big)^{m-1} L\left[w - Q(z,\chi,\tau)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Dividing both sides by $\big(w - Q(z,\chi,\tau)\big)^{m-1}$, we see that $L[w - Q(z,\chi,\tau)] \equiv 0$ on $\mathcal{M}$. This contradicts the holomorphic nondegeneracy of M. Thus, our assumption that $\det\big(H_Z(Z)\big) \equiv 0$ was incorrect. It follows, then, that $H(Z) = H(z,w)$ is a biholomorphism near some point in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. A similar argument applies to $\widetilde{H}(\chi,\tau)$. Thus, $\mathcal{H}$ is a biholomorphism near some point in $\mathbb{C}^{2n+2}$.

In fact, we can find $p_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{H}$ is a biholomorphism near p_0. Indeed, for (χ, z, w) sufficiently close to 0, $\big\{\big(\chi, \overline{Q}(\chi,z,w)\big)\big\}$ contains an open neighborhood of 0 in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ as $\overline{Q}(\chi,0,w) \equiv w$. And by assumption, $\det\big(\widetilde{H}_\zeta(\zeta)\big) \not\equiv 0$, where $\zeta = (\chi,\tau)$. So choose χ_0, z_0, w_0 sufficiently small so that

$$\det\Big(\widetilde{H}_\zeta\big(\chi_0, \overline{Q}(\chi_0, z_0, w_0)\big)\Big) \neq 0. \tag{2.5}$$

As $\det\big(H_Z(Z)\big) \not\equiv 0$, we can choose (z_0, w_0) so that $\det\big(H_Z\big(z_0, w_0\big)\big) \neq 0$, and also so that (2.5) holds.

Now we show that M' must be holomorphically nondegenerate. For simplicity, assume $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ are connected and that $\mathcal{M}$ is defined on $B \times B$, where $B \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ is a ball of sufficiently small radius centered at 0. We will also assume, hoping for a contradiction, that M' is holomorphically degenerate. Thus, it is holomorphically degenerate at all points, in particular at 0. Let

$$L' := \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} a'_j(Z') \frac{\partial}{\partial Z'_j}$$

be a nontrivial holomorphic vector field defined in a neighborhood U' of 0 and tangent to M' in U'. The preceding paragraph implies that there exists $(Z'_0, \zeta'_0) \in (U' \times {}^*U') \cap \mathcal{M}'$ such that $\mathcal{H}^{-1}$ exists near (Z'_0, ζ'_0).

Therefore, near the point $(Z'_0, \zeta'_0) := \big(H(z_0, w_0), \widetilde{H}(\chi_0, \overline{Q}(\chi_0, z_0, w_0)\big)$, we see that if $\rho(Z, \zeta) = w - Q(z, \chi, \tau)$, then $(\rho \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1})(Z', \zeta')$ is a defining function for $\mathcal{M}'$. Thus $L'(\rho \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1}) = 0$ for $(Z', \zeta') \in \mathcal{M}'$ near (Z'_0, ζ'_0). This then implies that $\mathcal{H}^{-1}_* L'(\rho) = 0$ for $(Z, \zeta) \in \mathcal{M}$ near $\big(z_0, w_0, \chi_0, \overline{Q}(\chi_0, z_0, w_0)\big)$ as $(Z', \zeta') \in \mathcal{M}'$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(Z', \zeta') \in \mathcal{M}$.

Note that if $L := d(z, w)\frac{\partial}{\partial w} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j(z, w)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}$ is tangent to M, where $d(z, w)$ and $c_j(z, w)$ are holomorphic functions, then $d(z, w) \equiv 0$. Indeed, apply L to $w - Q(z, \chi, \tau)$ to see that for all $(z, w, \chi, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}$, $d(z, w) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j(z, w) Q_{z_j}(z, \chi, \tau) = 0$. But normality of coordinates implies that $(z, w, 0, w) \in \mathcal{M}$ for all (z, w) sufficiently small. As $Q_{z_j}(z, 0, w) \equiv 0$, it follows that $d(z, w) \equiv 0$. Thus, we can write

$$\mathcal{H}^{-1}_* L' = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}.$$

The fact that this vector field is in terms of Z only, and not ζ, follows from the fact that $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(Z', \zeta') = \big(H^{-1}(Z'), \widetilde{H}^{-1}(\zeta')\big)$. Write

$$\overline{Q}(\chi, z, w) = \sum_{\alpha} \bar{q}_\alpha(z, w) \chi^\alpha.$$

So we see that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j(z, w) \bar{q}_{\alpha, z_j}(z, w) \equiv 0 \tag{2.6}$$

near $(z, w) = (z_0, w_0)$ for all α. To complete the proof, we present a lemma which is a slight rewording of Lemma 11.3.11 in [3]. We remind the reader that each $\bar{q}_\alpha(z, w)$ is defined on the ball B.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume there exists* $(z_0, w_0) \in B$ *and a germ at* (z_0, w_0) *of a nontrivial* $\mathbb{C}^n$*-valued holomorphic function* $a(z, w) = \big(a_1(z, w), \ldots, a_n(z, w)\big)$ *such that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j(z, w)\bar{q}_{\alpha,z_j}(z, w) \equiv 0,$$

for all α *and all* (z, w) *near* (z_0, w_0)*. Then there exists a nontrivial* $\mathbb{C}^n$*-valued holomorphic function* $b(z, w) = \big(b_1(z, w), \ldots, b_n(z, w)\big)$ *defined in* B *such that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j(z, w)\bar{q}_{\alpha,z_j}(z, w) \equiv 0, \tag{2.7}$$

for all α *and all* $(z, w) \in B$*.*

To complete the proof of our theorem, we define

$$L := \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j(z, w)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}, \tag{2.8}$$

where the b_j are as given in Lemma 2.1. Then L is a holomorphic vector field tangent to M on B, which implies that M is holomorphically degenerate, a contradiction. □

2.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.3.** We first present two lemmas.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume* M *is of finite type at* 0 *and* M' *is of infinite type at* 0*. Then the only HSPMs sending* $(\mathcal{M}, 0)$ *into* $(\mathcal{M}', 0)$ *are of the form*

$$\mathcal{H}(z, w, \chi, \tau) = \big(f(z, w), 0, \tilde{f}(\chi, \tau), 0\big), \tag{2.9}$$

for any $\mathbb{C}^n$*-valued holomorphic maps* $f(z, w)$ *and* $\tilde{f}(\chi, \tau)$ *satisfying* $f(0) = \tilde{f}(0) = 0$*.*

Proof. As $\mathcal{H}$ sends $\mathcal{M}$ into $\mathcal{M}'$, there exists a holomorphic function $A(z, w, \chi, \tau)$ such that

$$g(z, w) - Q'\big(f(z, w), \tilde{f}(\chi, \tau), \tilde{g}(\chi, \tau)\big) = A(z, w, \chi, \tau)\big(w - Q(z, \chi, \tau)\big). \tag{2.10}$$

As normality of coordinates implies that $g(z, 0) \equiv \tilde{g}(\chi, 0) \equiv 0$, and M' being of infinite type at 0 implies that $Q'(z', \chi', 0) \equiv 0$, we substitute $\tau = 0$ into (2.10) to see that

$$g(z, w) = A(z, w, \chi, 0)\big(w - Q(z, \chi, 0)\big). \tag{2.11}$$

However, M is of finite type at 0, which implies that $Q(z, \chi, 0) \not\equiv 0$. Yet $Q(z, 0, 0)$ is identically zero. Thus, $Q(z, \chi, 0)$ must depend on χ. Assume $A(z, w, \chi, 0) \not\equiv 0$, and write $A(z, w, \chi, 0) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j(z, \chi)w^j$. Notice that we start our index j at 1 instead of 0. Indeed, if we substitute $w = 0$ into (2.11), we see that $A(z, 0, \chi, 0) \equiv 0$. Let j_0 be the smallest positive integer such that $a_{j_0} \not\equiv 0$, but $a_j \equiv 0$ for all $j < j_0$. Then when we Taylor expand the right hand side of (2.11) in w, the lowest order term (i.e., the term with the smallest w exponent) is $-a_{j_0}(z, \chi)Q(z, \chi, 0)w^{j_0}$. Therefore, the right hand side of (2.11) depends on χ, but the left hand side does not. This is a contradiction. Thus, our assumption that $A(z,w,\chi,0)\not\equiv 0$ is incorrect, implying that $g(z,w)\equiv 0$. Similarly $\tilde{g}(\chi,\tau)\equiv 0$. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *Let M, M', and $\mathcal{H}$ be as in Theorem 1.3. Assume $g(z,w)\not\equiv 0$. Then* $\det\left(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\right)\not\equiv 0$. *Similarly, $\tilde{g}(\chi,\tau)\not\equiv 0$ implies that* $\det\left(f_z(z,0)\right)\not\equiv 0$.

Proof. We will prove the contrapositive. Assume $\det\left(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\right)\equiv 0$. We will show, then, that $g_{w^k}(z,0)\equiv 0$ for all k. This in turn implies that $g(z,w)\equiv 0$. We start with the identity

$$g\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)=Q'\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big). \tag{2.12}$$

Take $\frac{\partial}{\partial\chi}$ of (2.12) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\Bigg(g_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}Q'_{z'_j}\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big)f^j_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)\Bigg)&\\ \times\big(Q_\chi(z,\chi,0)\big)=\Big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\Big)\Big(Q'_{\chi'}\big(f(z,Q(z,\chi,0)),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\big)\Big).&\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Now assume, looking for a contradiction, that

$$g_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}Q'_{z'_j}\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big)f^j_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)\not\equiv 0. \tag{2.14}$$

Divide both sides of (2.13) by (2.14) to get

$$\Big(Q_\chi(z,\chi,0)\Big)=\Big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\Big)\Big(r(z,\chi)\Big), \tag{2.15}$$

where $r(z,\chi)$ is a $\mathbb{C}^n$-valued holomorphic function, defined near 0 and whenever the expression given in (2.14) is not equal to 0. Now take $\frac{\partial^{|\alpha|}}{\partial z^\alpha}$ of (2.15) to get

$$\Big(Q_{\chi z^\alpha}(z,\chi,0)\Big)=\Big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\Big)\Big(R_\alpha(z,\chi)\Big), \tag{2.16}$$

where $R_\alpha(z,\chi):=\frac{\partial^{|\alpha|}r}{\partial z^\alpha}(z,\chi)$. As M is of class $\mathcal{C}$ at 0, choose $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n$ so that the vectors $Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_1}}(0,\chi,0),\ldots,Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_n}}(0,\chi,0)$ span $\mathbb{C}^n$ for all $\chi\in U\backslash V$, where $U\subseteq\mathbb{C}^n$ is an open neighborhood of the origin, and V is a proper holomorphic subvariety of U. Extend (2.16) to the following matrix equation:

$$\Big(Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_1}}(z,\chi,0),\ldots,Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_n}}(z,\chi,0)\Big)=\Big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\Big)\Big(R_{\alpha_1}(z,\chi),\ldots,R_{\alpha_n}(z,\chi)\Big). \tag{2.17}$$

The matrix on the left hand side of (2.17) is invertible for some (z,χ). This contradicts our assumption about $\det\left(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\right)$. Thus our assumption was incorrect. That is, we have

$$g_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}Q'_{z'_j}\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big)f^j_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)\equiv 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Let $\chi = 0$ in (2.18) to see that

$$g_w(z, 0) \equiv 0. \tag{2.19}$$

This is the base step of our inductive argument. Now assume for some $k \geq 1$ we have

$$g(z, 0) \equiv g_w(z, 0) \equiv \ldots \equiv g_{w^k}(z, 0) \equiv 0, \tag{2.20}$$

as well as

$$g_{w^k}\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big) = \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} Q'_{z'^\alpha}\Big(f\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big), \tilde{f}(\chi, 0), 0\Big) S^k_\alpha(z, \chi), \tag{2.21}$$

where each $S^k_\alpha(z, \chi)$ is the sum of constant multiples of all possible products of the $f^j_{w^i}\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big)$, with $i \leq k$. To complete our induction, we will show that

$$g_{w^{k+1}}\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big) = \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq k+1} Q'_{z'^\alpha}\Big(f\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big), \tilde{f}(\chi, 0), 0\Big) S^{k+1}_\alpha(z, \chi), \tag{2.22}$$

where each $S^{k+1}_\alpha(z, \chi)$ is the sum of constant multiples of all possible products of the $f^j_{w^i}\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big)$, with $i \leq k+1$. From this, it immediately follows that

$$g_{w^{k+1}}(z, 0) \equiv 0. \tag{2.23}$$

Take $\frac{\partial}{\partial \chi}$ of (2.21). This gives us

$$\left(g_{w^{k+1}}\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big) - \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq k+1} Q'_{z'^\alpha}\Big(f\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big), \tilde{f}(\chi, 0), 0\Big) S^{k+1}_\alpha(z, \chi)\right)$$
$$\times \Big(Q_\chi(z, \chi, 0)\Big) = \Big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi, 0)\Big)\Big(T(z, \chi)\Big), \tag{2.24}$$

where $T(z, \chi)$ is a $\mathbb{C}^n$-valued holomorphic function defined near 0. The induction step is now proved exactly as the base case was proved. □

Now for the proof of Theorem 1.3. As M is of class $\mathcal{C}$ at 0, and thus holomorphically nondegenerate, we see that either the first conclusion of Theorem 1.2 holds, or we have $g \not\equiv 0$ and $\tilde{g} \not\equiv 0$. Assume the latter. Then Theorem 1.2 implies that $\mathcal{H}$ is a biholomorphism near some $p \in \mathcal{M}$. Lemma 2.3 implies that $\det\big(f_z(z, 0)\big) \not\equiv 0$ and $\det\big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi, 0)\big) \not\equiv 0$. From Lemma 2.2, we see that M' is of finite type at 0 (since M being of class $\mathcal{C}$ at 0 implies it is of finite type at 0). Thus, from Theorem 1.1 we see that $\mathcal{H}$ is Segre transversal to $\mathcal{M}'$ at 0.

Now differentiate (2.12) with respect to z_l, for some l:

$$Q_{z_l}(z, \chi, 0) =$$
$$\left(g_w\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} Q'_{z'_j}\Big(f\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big), \tilde{f}(\chi, 0), 0\Big) f^j_w\big(z, Q(z, \chi, 0)\big)\right)^{-1}$$

$$\times\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} Q'_{z'_j}\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big)\, f^j_{z_l}\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)-g_{z_l}\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)\right). \tag{2.25}$$

Notice that the right hand side of (2.25) is in fact holomorphic near 0 as $g_w(0)\neq 0$. Thus, we can rewrite (2.25) in the following way:

$$Q_{z_l}(z,\chi,0)=$$

$$\frac{P_l\left(Q'_{z'_j}\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big)\Big|_{1\leq j\leq n},\, H_{z_l}\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)\right)}{g_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n} Q'_{z'_j}\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big)\, f^j_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)}, \tag{2.26}$$

where P_l is a polynomial defined on $\mathbb{C}^n\times\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. We can inductively differentiate (2.26) with respect to z_k for some k to get

$$Q_{z^\alpha}(z,\chi,0)=$$

$$\frac{P_\alpha\left(Q'_{z'^\beta}\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big)\Big|_{|\beta|\leq|\alpha|},\, H_{z^\beta w^\gamma}\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)\big|_{|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq|\alpha|}\right)}{\left(g_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n} Q'_{z'_j}\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big)\, f^j_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)\right)^{t_\alpha}}, \tag{2.27}$$

where $t_\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ and P_α is a polynomial defined on $\mathbb{C}^{k_\alpha}\times\mathbb{C}^{l_\alpha}$, for some integers k_α and l_α. (Notice that when we differentiate the right hand side of (2.27) with respect to z_k, the numerator actually becomes a polynomial function of $Q_{z_k}(z,\chi,0)$ as well, but we can use (2.26) to achieve the form given in (2.27)). Now set $z=0$ in (2.27) to get

$$Q_{z^\alpha}(0,\chi,0)=R_\alpha\Big(Q'_{z'^\beta}\big(0,\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\big)\big|_{|\beta|\leq|\alpha|},\, j_0^{|\alpha|}H\Big), \tag{2.28}$$

where R_α is a rational function on $\mathbb{C}^{k_\alpha}\times\mathbb{C}^{l_\alpha}$, defined for χ sufficiently close to 0. As M is of class $\mathcal{C}$ at 0, there exist $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n$ such that $Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_1}}(0,\chi,0),\ldots,Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_n}}(0,\chi,0)$ span $\mathbb{C}^n$ for all $\chi\in U\backslash V$, where $U\subseteq\mathbb{C}^n$ is an open neighborhood of the origin, and V is a proper holomorphic subvariety of U. For convenience, let $k:=\max(|\alpha_1|,\ldots,|\alpha_n|)$. Using the R_α defined in (2.28), we define a $\mathbb{C}^n$-valued rational function $R(y)$ defined (for y sufficiently small) on $\mathbb{C}^{l_k}$, where l_k is the cardinality of the set $\{\beta:|\beta|\leq k\}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\ Q_{z^{\alpha_1}}(0,\chi,0),\ldots,Q_{z^{\alpha_n}}(0,\chi,0)\ \big)&=\left(R_{\alpha_j}\left(Q'_{z'^\beta}\big(0,\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\big)\Big|_{|\beta|\leq|\alpha_j|},\, j_0^{|\alpha_j|}H\right)\right)\Bigg|_{1\leq j\leq n}\\&=R\Big(Q'_{z'^\beta}\big(0,\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\big)\big|_{|\beta|\leq k}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

We differentiate (2.29) with respect to χ, applying the chain rule to get:

$$\big(\ Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_1}}(0,\chi,0),\ldots,Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_n}}(0,\chi,0)\ \big)=$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial R}{\partial y}\left(Q'_{z'^{\beta}}\left(0,\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\right)\big|_{|\beta|\le k}\right)\right)\left(\frac{\partial Q'}{\partial z'^{\beta}\partial\chi'}\left(0,\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\right)\big|_{|\beta|\le k}\right)\left(\frac{\partial\tilde{f}}{\partial\chi}(\chi,0)\right). \qquad (2.30)$$

As the rank of the matrix on the left hand side of (2.30) is n for all $\chi\in U\backslash V$, we see that the rank of the $l_k\times n$ matrix $\left(\frac{\partial Q'}{\partial z'^{\beta}\partial\chi'}\left(0,\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\right)\big|_{|\beta|\le k}\right)$ must also be n for all $\chi\in U\backslash V$, which implies, in particular, that M' is of class $\mathcal{C}$ at 0. The proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete. □

2.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.4.** We now prove Theorem 1.4 which follows immediately from the proof of Theorem 1.3. As M is finitely nondegenerate, and thus of class $\mathcal{C}$, at 0, either the first conclusion of Theorem 1.3 holds, or the second conclusion holds. Assume the latter. Then the fact that M' is finitely nondegenerate at 0 and the fact that $\det\left(\tilde{f}_\chi(0)\right)\neq 0$ follows immediately by letting $\chi=0$ in (2.30), where we choose $\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n$ so that $Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_1}}(0),\dots,Q_{\chi z^{\alpha_n}}(0)$ span $\mathbb{C}^n$. Similarly, $\det\left(f_z(0)\right)\neq 0$. □

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.5.** We begin with a lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Let M be finitely nondegenerate at* 0*. Then for any neighborhood* $0\in U\subseteq\mathbb{C}^n$*, there exist* $a_1,\dots,a_n\in U$ *such that the vectors* $\overline{Q}_z(a_1,0,0),\dots,\overline{Q}_z(a_n,0,0)$ *are linearly independent.*

Proof. Assume, hoping for a contradiction, that the conclusion is false. Introduce new variables $\eta_1,\dots,\eta_n\in\mathbb{C}^n$, and let $\eta=(\eta_1,\dots,\eta_n)$. Define the matrix $A(\eta):=\big(\overline{Q}_z(\eta_1,0,0),\dots,\overline{Q}_z(\eta_n,0,0)\big)$. Then there exists an open neighborhood $0\in V\subseteq\mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\det A(\eta)\equiv 0$ for all $\eta_1,\dots,\eta_n\in V$. By finite nondegeneracy, assume $\overline{Q}_{z\chi^{\alpha_1}}(0),\dots,\overline{Q}_{z\chi^{\alpha_n}}(0)$ span $\mathbb{C}^n$. Now take $\dfrac{\partial^{|\alpha_1|+\ldots+|\alpha_n|}}{\partial\eta_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots\partial\eta_n^{\alpha_n}}$ of the identity $\det A(\eta)\equiv 0$ to get

$$\det\left(\overline{Q}_{z\chi^{\alpha_1}}(\eta_1,0,0),\dots,\overline{Q}_{z\chi^{\alpha_n}}(\eta_n,0,0)\right)\equiv 0. \qquad (2.31)$$

This is clearly false, as finite nondegeneracy implies that this determinant is nonzero when $\eta=0$. □

We now prove Theorem 1.5. We remind the reader of (2.13) :

$$\left(g_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}Q'_{z'_j}\Big(f\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\Big)f^j_w\big(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\big)\right)$$
$$\times\Big(Q_\chi(z,\chi,0)\Big)=\Big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0)\Big)\Big(Q'_{\chi'}\big(f\left(z,Q(z,\chi,0)\right),\tilde{f}(\chi,0),0\big)\Big). \qquad (2.32)$$

Complex conjugation gives

$$\left(\bar{g}_\tau\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}\overline{Q}'_{\chi'_j}\Big(\bar{f}\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big),\bar{\tilde{f}}(z,0),0\Big)\bar{f}^j_\tau\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big)\right)$$

$$\times\left(\overline{Q}_z(\chi,z,0)\right)=\left(\bar{\bar{f}}_z(z,0)\right)\left(\overline{Q}'_{z'}\big(\bar{f}\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big),\bar{\bar{f}}(z,0),0\big)\right). \tag{2.33}$$

Now we will take $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ of the identity

$$\tilde{g}\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big)=\overline{Q}'\Big(\tilde{f}\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big),f(z,0),0\Big) \tag{2.34}$$

to get

$$\left(\tilde{g}_\tau\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}\overline{Q}'_{\chi'_j}\Big(\tilde{f}\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big),f(z,0),0\Big)\tilde{f}^j_\tau\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big)\right)$$

$$\times\left(\overline{Q}_z(\chi,z,0)\right)=\left(f_z(z,0)\right)\left(\overline{Q}'_{z'}\big(\tilde{f}\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big),f(z,0),0\big)\right). \tag{2.35}$$

From Theorem 1.1, as M' is finitely nondegenerate at 0, and thus of finite type at 0, we know that $g_w(0)=\tilde{g}_\tau(0)\neq 0$. So the Taylor expansions at 0 of both

$$\bar{g}_\tau\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}\overline{Q}'_{\chi'_j}\Big(\bar{f}\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big),\bar{\bar{f}}(z,0),0\Big)\bar{f}^j_\tau\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big) \tag{2.36}$$

and

$$\tilde{g}_\tau\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}\overline{Q}'_{\chi'_j}\Big(\tilde{f}\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big),f(z,0),0\Big)\tilde{f}^j_\tau\big(\chi,\overline{Q}(\chi,z,0)\big) \tag{2.37}$$

have nonzero constant terms. From Lemma 2.4, coupled with our assumptions about f and $\tilde{f}$, we can find $a_1,\dots,a_n$ sufficiently small so that the following hold:

(i) $\tilde{g}_\tau(a_j,0)\neq 0$
(ii) $\bar{g}_\tau(a_j,0)\neq 0$
(iii) $\overline{Q}'_z\big(\tilde{f}(a_1,0),0,0\big),\dots,\overline{Q}'_z\big(\tilde{f}(a_n,0),0,0\big)$ span $\mathbb{C}^n$
(iv) $\overline{Q}'_z\big(\bar{f}(a_1,0),0,0\big),\dots,\overline{Q}'_z\big(\bar{f}(a_n,0),0,0\big)$ span $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Now define

$$r_j(z):=$$

$$\bar{g}_\tau\big(a_j,\overline{Q}(a_j,z,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}\overline{Q}'_{\chi'_j}\Big(\bar{f}\big(a_j,\overline{Q}(a_j,z,0)\big),\bar{\bar{f}}(z,0),0\Big)\bar{f}^j_\tau\big(a_j,\overline{Q}(a_j,z,0)\big), \tag{2.38}$$

and

$$s_j(z):=$$

$$\tilde{g}_\tau\big(a_j,\overline{Q}(a_j,z,0)\big)-\sum_{j=1}^{n}\overline{Q}'_{\chi'_j}\Big(\tilde{f}\big(a_j,\overline{Q}(a_j,z,0)\big),f(z,0),0\Big)\tilde{f}^j_\tau\big(a_j,\overline{Q}(a_j,z,0)\big). \tag{2.39}$$

Note that our choice of a_j implies that $r_j(0) \neq 0$ and $s_j(0) \neq 0$. Thus we can form new matrix equations from (2.33) and (2.35) by extending the column matrices as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}_{z_1}(a_1, z, 0) & \dots & \overline{Q}_{z_1}(a_n, z, 0) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \overline{Q}_{z_n}(a_1, z, 0) & \dots & \overline{Q}_{z_n}(a_n, z, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\tilde{f}}^1_{z_1}(z, 0) & \dots & \bar{\tilde{f}}^n_{z_1}(z, 0) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bar{\tilde{f}}^1_{z_n}(z, 0) & \dots & \bar{\tilde{f}}^n_{z_n}(z, 0) \end{pmatrix} \times$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\overline{Q}'_{z'_1}\left(\bar{f}\left(a_1, \overline{Q}(a_1, z, 0)\right), \bar{\tilde{f}}(z,0), 0\right)}{r_1(z)} & \dots & \frac{\overline{Q}'_{z'_1}\left(\bar{f}\left(a_n, \overline{Q}(a_n, z, 0)\right), \bar{\tilde{f}}(z,0), 0\right)}{r_n(z)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{\overline{Q}'_{z'_n}\left(\bar{f}\left(a_1, \overline{Q}(a_1, z, 0)\right), \bar{\tilde{f}}(z,0), 0\right)}{r_1(z)} & \dots & \frac{\overline{Q}'_{z'_n}\left(\bar{f}\left(a_n, \overline{Q}(a_n, z, 0)\right), \bar{\tilde{f}}(z,0), 0\right)}{r_n(z)} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.40}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}_{z_1}(a_1, z, 0) & \dots & \overline{Q}_{z_1}(a_n, z, 0) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \overline{Q}_{z_n}(a_1, z, 0) & \dots & \overline{Q}_{z_n}(a_n, z, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f^1_{z_1}(z, 0) & \dots & f^n_{z_1}(z, 0) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ f^1_{z_n}(z, 0) & \dots & f^n_{z_n}(z, 0) \end{pmatrix} \times$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\overline{Q}'_{z'_1}\left(\tilde{f}\left(a_1, \overline{Q}(a_1, z, 0)\right), f(z,0), 0\right)}{s_1(z)} & \dots & \frac{\overline{Q}'_{z'_1}\left(\tilde{f}\left(a_n, \overline{Q}(a_n, z, 0)\right), f(z,0), 0\right)}{s_n(z)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{\overline{Q}'_{z'_n}\left(\tilde{f}\left(a_1, \overline{Q}(a_1, z, 0)\right), f(z,0), 0\right)}{s_1(z)} & \dots & \frac{\overline{Q}'_{z'_n}\left(\tilde{f}\left(a_n, \overline{Q}(a_n, z, 0)\right), f(z,0), 0\right)}{s_n(z)} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.41}$$

We set the right hand sides of (2.40) and (2.41) equal, and take determinants to see that for z sufficiently small

$$\Big(\det\left(\bar{\tilde{f}}_z(z,0)\right)\Big)\Big(\det C(z)\Big)\left(\prod_{j=1}^{n} s_j(z)\right) = \Big(\det\left(f_z(z,0)\right)\Big)\Big(\det D(z)\Big)\left(\prod_{j=1}^{n} r_j(z)\right), \tag{2.42}$$

where

$$C(z) :=$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}'_{z'_1}\left(\bar{f}\left(a_1, \overline{Q}(a_1, z, 0)\right), \bar{\tilde{f}}(z, 0), 0\right) & \dots & \overline{Q}'_{z'_1}\left(\bar{f}\left(a_n, \overline{Q}(a_n, z, 0)\right), \bar{\tilde{f}}(z, 0), 0\right) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \overline{Q}'_{z'_n}\left(\bar{f}\left(a_1, \overline{Q}(a_1, z, 0)\right), \bar{\tilde{f}}(z, 0), 0\right) & \dots & \overline{Q}'_{z'_n}\left(\bar{f}\left(a_n, \overline{Q}(a_n, z, 0)\right), \bar{\tilde{f}}(z, 0), 0\right) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.43}$$

and

$$D(z) :=$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}'_{z'_1}\Big(\tilde{f}\big(a_1, \overline{Q}(a_1, z, 0)\big), f(z,0), 0\Big) & \ldots & \overline{Q}'_{z'_1}\Big(\tilde{f}\big(a_n, \overline{Q}(a_n, z, 0)\big), f(z,0), 0\Big) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \overline{Q}'_{z'_n}\Big(\tilde{f}\big(a_1, \overline{Q}(a_1, z, 0)\big), f(z,0), 0\Big) & \ldots & \overline{Q}'_{z'_n}\Big(\tilde{f}\big(a_n, \overline{Q}(a_n, z, 0)\big), f(z,0), 0\Big) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.44)$$

However, $\det C(0) \neq 0$, $\prod_{j=1}^{n} s_j(0) \neq 0$, $\det D(0) \neq 0$, and $\prod_{j=1}^{n} r_j(0) \neq 0$. Thus, (2.42) implies that the lowest order homogeneous polynomial in the Taylor expansion of $\det\big(\bar{\tilde{f}}(z,0)\big)$ is equal (up to a constant) to the lowest order homogeneous polynomial in the Taylor expansion of $\det\big(f(z,0)\big)$. The theorem follows. $\square$

2.5. **Proof of Theorem 1.6.** First we show that (i) implies (ii) and (iii). Theorem 1.1 implies that $\mathcal{H}$ is Segre transversal to $\mathcal{M}'$ at 0. The fact that M is of finite type at 0 follows from the identity

$$g\big(z, Q(z,\chi,0)\big) \equiv Q'\Big(f\big(z, Q(z,\chi,0)\big), \tilde{f}(\chi,0), 0\Big). \quad (2.45)$$

Indeed, if M is not of finite type at 0, then $Q(z,\chi,0) \equiv 0$, and equation (2.45) becomes

$$0 \equiv Q'\big(f(z,0), \tilde{f}(\chi,0), 0\big). \quad (2.46)$$

(Normality of coordinates implies that $g(z,0) \equiv 0$.) However, this contradicts the fact that M' is of finite type at 0, as $f_z(z,0) \not\equiv 0$ and $\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi,0) \not\equiv 0$.

We note that each of (ii) and (iii) imply (i). This follows from the fact that in $\mathbb{C}^2$, being of finite type at 0 is equivalent to being of class $\mathcal{C}$ at 0. Thus, (i) follows from Theorem 1.3.

Now we prove that $f(z,0)$ and $\tilde{f}(\chi,0)$ have the same order of vanishing. As M is of finite type at 0, we have that $Q(z,\chi,0) \not\equiv 0$. Due to normality of coordinates, we can write

$$Q(z,\chi,0) = \chi^m \alpha(z) + \chi^{m+1}\beta(z,\chi), \quad (2.47)$$

where $\alpha(z)$ and $\beta(z,\chi)$ are holomorphic functions defined for z and χ near 0, m is a positive integer, and

$$\alpha(z) = \sum_{j=r}^{\infty} a_j z^j \quad (2.48)$$

is the Taylor expansion for $\alpha(z)$, with $a_r \neq 0$. In a similar manner, we can write

$$Q(z,\chi,0) = z^n \tilde{\alpha}(\chi) + z^{n+1}\tilde{\beta}(z,\chi), \quad (2.49)$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}(\chi)$ and $\tilde{\beta}(z,\chi)$ are holomorphic functions, n is a positive integer, and

$$\tilde{\alpha}(\chi) = \sum_{j=s}^{\infty} \tilde{a}_j \chi^j \quad (2.50)$$

is the Taylor expansion for $\tilde{\alpha}(\chi)$, with $\tilde{a}_s \neq 0$. We make the following observation.

Observation 2.5. $m = n$ and $r = s$.

Indeed, by the reality of our hypersurface,

$$Q\big(z, \chi, \overline{Q}(\chi, z, 0)\big) \equiv 0. \tag{2.51}$$

Due to normality of coordinates, expanding the left hand side of this identity gives us

$$-Q(z, \chi, 0) \equiv \overline{Q}(\chi, z, 0)\big(1 + \chi z \phi(\chi, z)\big), \tag{2.52}$$

where $\phi(\chi, z)$ is a holomorphic function defined near $\chi = z = 0$. Taking the complex conjugate of (2.47), it follows that the nonzero term in the Taylor expansion of the right hand side of (2.52) with the smallest z exponent, and then the smallest χ exponent given this z exponent, is $\bar{a}_r z^m \chi^r$. It follows then that the nonzero term in the Taylor expansion $Q(z, \chi, 0)$ with the smallest z exponent, and then the smallest χ exponent given this z exponent, is $-\bar{a}_r z^m \chi^r$. However, this is equal to $\tilde{\alpha}_s z^n \chi^s$ by (2.49). This proves Observation 2.5.

Now back to the proof of Theorem 1.6. There exists a holomorphic function $A(z, \chi, w, \tau)$ defined near 0 such that

$$g(z, w) - Q'\big(f(z, w), \tilde{f}(\chi, \tau), \tilde{g}(\chi, \tau)\big) = A(z, \chi, w, \tau)\big(w - Q(z, \chi, \tau)\big). \tag{2.53}$$

Letting $w = \tau = 0$ in (2.53), we have

$$Q'\big(f(z, 0), \tilde{f}(\chi, 0), 0\big) = A(z, \chi, 0, 0)Q(z, \chi, 0). \tag{2.54}$$

The left hand side of (2.53) has a pure w term, as $g_w(0) \neq 0$. Thus, the right hand side must have one as well, implying that $A(0) \neq 0$. In light of Observation 2.5, if the nonzero term in the Taylor expansion of the right hand side of (2.54) with the smallest z exponent, and then the smallest χ exponent given this z exponent, is $cz^n\chi^s$, for some $c \neq 0$, then the nonzero term with the smallest χ exponent, and then the smallest z exponent given this χ exponent, is $d\chi^n z^s$, for some $d \neq 0$. Thus, the same goes for the left hand side of (2.54). As M' is of finite type at 0, Observation 2.5 implies that $f(z, 0)$ and $\tilde{f}(\chi, 0)$ must have the same order of vanishing. In particular, if $M = M'$, then $f(z, 0)$ and $\tilde{f}(\chi, 0)$ must have linear terms, implying that $\mathcal{H}$ is a biholomorphism near 0. □

3. Examples

In order to simplify notation in this section, we will drop the convention of using a $'$ to designate the coordinates of the target hypersurface. The context will render this simplification unambiguous.

In Theorem 1.1, we cannot weaken the hypothesis that M' is of finite type at 0, as the following example illustrates.

Example 3.1. Let $M = M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2$ be given by

$$M = \left\{ \operatorname{Im} w = \operatorname{Re} w \left(\frac{\sin |z|^2}{\cos |z|^2 + 1} \right) \right\}.$$

Then its complexification is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \{w = \tau e^{iz\chi}\}.$$

Note that M is of infinite type at 0. Let

$$\mathcal{H}(z,w,\chi,\tau) = \left(H(z,w), \widetilde{H}(\chi,\tau)\right) = \left(\sqrt{2}z, w^2, \sqrt{2}\chi, \tau^2\right).$$

This map satisfies the criteria of Theorem 1.1, yet is not Segre transversal to $\mathcal{M}'$ at 0. As an aside, notice that $\widetilde{H} = \overline{H}$, and thus the map $H(z,w) = \left(\sqrt{2}z, w^2\right)$ sends M into itself.

The conclusion of Theorem 1.2 does not necessarily hold if M is holomorphically degenerate, as the following example illustrates.

Example 3.2. Let $M, M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^3$ be given by $M = \{\text{Im } w = |z_1|^2\}$ and $M' = \{\text{Im } w = |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2\}$. Notice that M is holomorphically degenerate and M' is finitely nondegenerate at 0. Define $\mathcal{H}(z,w,\chi,\tau) = (z_1^2, 2z_1, w^2, 2i\chi_1^2, \chi_1\tau, \tau^2)$. Then $\mathcal{H}$ sends $(\mathcal{M},0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}',0)$ and is not transversally null. Notice, however, that $\mathcal{H}$ has Jacobian determinant identically zero. In addition, $\mathcal{H}$ is neither totally nor partially Segre nondegenerate at 0, nor is $\mathcal{H}$ Segre transversal to $\mathcal{M}'$ at 0.

The conclusion of Theorem 1.2 cannot be improved to that of Theorem 1.3. As an illustration, notice that in Example 3.1, $\mathcal{M}$ is holomorphically nondegenerate, yet Segre transversality does not hold. Also, Segre nondegeneracy may not hold as the next example illustrates.

Example 3.3. Let $M, M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^3$ be given by $M = \{\text{Im } w = |z_1 w|^2 + |z_2|^2\}$ (defined implicitly) and $M' = \{\text{Im } w = |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2\}$. Notice that M is in fact given in normal coordinates as we have

$$\mathcal{M} = \left\{ w = \frac{\tau + 2iz_2\chi_2}{1 - 2iz_1\chi_1\tau} \right\}.$$

It can be checked that M is holomorphically nondegenerate and M' is finitely nondegenerate at 0. Define

$$\mathcal{H}(z,w,\chi,\tau) = \left(H(z,w), \widetilde{H}(\chi,\tau)\right) = (z_1 w, z_2, w, \chi_1\tau, \chi_2, \tau).$$

Then $\mathcal{H}$ sends $(\mathcal{M},0)$ into $(\mathcal{M}',0)$ and is neither totally nor partially Segre nondegenerate at 0. Notice also that $\widetilde{H} = \overline{H}$ and, thus, $H(M) \subseteq M'$.

In Theorem 1.5, we note that the agreement of the determinants may end after the lowest order homogeneous polynomial.

Example 3.4. Let $M = M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2$ be the *Lewy hypersurface* given by $M = \{\text{Im w} = |z|^2\}$. Then M is finitely nondegenerate at 0. Define the following HSPM which sends $(\mathcal{M},0)$ into $(\mathcal{M},0)$:

$$\mathcal{H}(z,w,\chi,\tau) = \left(\frac{2z}{1-2iz}, \frac{w}{1-2iz}, \frac{1}{2}\chi + \frac{1}{2}\tau, \tau \right).$$

If M' is finitely degenerate at 0, then the next example shows that the conclusion of Theorem 1.5 does not necessarily hold, even if M' is essentially finite at 0.

Example 3.5. Let $M, M' \subseteq \mathbb{C}^6$ be given by

$$M = \Big\{ \text{Im } w = 2\text{Re}\big(z_1\bar{z}_2 + z_4^2(\bar{z}_1 + \bar{z}_3 + \bar{z}_5^2) + z_2(\bar{z}_3 + \bar{z}_5^2)\big) + |z_3|^2 + |z_4|^4 + |z_5|^4 \Big\},$$

$$M' = \Big\{ \text{Im } w = 2\text{Re}(z_3\bar{z}_4^2) + |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 + |z_5|^2 \Big\}.$$

Note that M is finitely nondegenerate at 0, and M' is essentially finite at 0. The complexifications are given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \Big\{ \frac{w-\tau}{2i} = z_1\chi_2 + \chi_1 z_2 + z_4^2\chi_1 + \chi_4^2 z_1$$

$$+ z_4^2\chi_3 + \chi_4^2 z_3 + z_4^2\chi_5^2 + \chi_4^2 z_5^2 + z_2\chi_3 + \chi_2 z_3 + z_2\chi_5^2 + \chi_2 z_5^2 + z_3\chi_3 + z_4^2\chi_4^2 + z_5^2\chi_5^2 \Big\},$$

$$\mathcal{M}' = \Big\{ \frac{w-\tau}{2i} = z_3\chi_4^2 + \chi_3 z_4^2 + z_1\chi_1 + z_2\chi_2 + z_5\chi_5 \Big\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}(z, w, \chi, \tau) = \Big(H(z, w), \widetilde{H}(\chi, \tau)\Big) = \Big(f(z, w), g(z, w), \tilde{f}(\chi, \tau), \tilde{g}(\chi, \tau)\Big)$ be defined by

$$H(z, w) = \big(z_1 + z_3, z_4^2 + z_2, z_1 + z_3 + z_4^2, z_5, z_3, w\big),$$

and

$$\widetilde{H}(\chi, \tau) = \big(\chi_2, \chi_1 + \chi_3 + \chi_5^2, \chi_2 + \chi_4^2 + \chi_5^2, \chi_4, \chi_3, \tau\big).$$

It is easy to show that $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}'$, yet a simple computation proves that det $\big(f_z(z, 0)\big) = 2z_4$, and det $\big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi, 0)\big) = 2\chi_5$.

Finally we turn to Theorem 1.6. The fact that (i) implies (ii) and (iii) actually holds in $\mathbb{C}^N$ for any $N \geq 2$. This is clear by examining the first paragraph of the proof of Theorem 1.6. However, if we let $r(z)$ denote the lowest order nonzero homogeneous polynomial in the Taylor expansion of det $\big(f_z(z, 0)\big)$, then the lowest order nonzero homogeneous polynomial in the Taylor expansion of det $\big(\tilde{f}_\chi(\chi, 0)\big)$ is not necessarily equal to a constant multiple of $\bar{r}(\chi)$, as Example 3.5 illustrates. In $\mathbb{C}^N$ for $N > 2$, the other implications, except, of course, (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii), do not necessarily follow. Example 3.2 illustrates that (ii) $\not\Rightarrow$ (i) and (ii) $\not\Rightarrow$ (iii). Example 3.3 illustrates that (iii) $\not\Rightarrow$ (i).

REFERENCES

[1] Angle, R. B.: *Holomorphic Segre Preserving Maps,* PhD thesis, University of California, San Diego, 2008.

[2] Angle, R. B.: Parametrization of holomorphic Segre preserving maps. (preprint, 2008).

[3] Baouendi, M. S.; Ebenfelt, P.; and Rothschild, L.P.: *Real Submanifolds in Complex Space and Their Mappings.* Princeton Math. Series **47**, Princeton Univ. Press, 1999.

[4] Bloom, T.; Graham, I.: On "type" conditions for generic real submanifolds of $\mathbb{C}^n$. *Invent. Math.*, **40**, 217-243, (1977).

[5] Ebenfelt, P.; Rothschild, L. P.: Transversality of CR mappings. *Amer. J. Math.*, **128**, 1313-1343, (2006).

[6] Faran, J.: Segre families and real hypersurfaces. *Invent. Math.*, **60**, 135-172, (1980).

[7] Kohn, J. J.: Boundary behavior of $\bar{\partial}$ on weakly pseudo-convex manifolds of dimension two. *J. Diff. Geom.* **6**, 523-542, (1972).

[8] Lamel, B.; Mir, N.: Parametrization of local CR automorphisms by finite jets and applications. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **20**, 519-572, (2007).

[9] Stanton, N.: Infinitesimal CR automorphisms of real hypersurfaces. *Amer. J. Math.*, **118**, 209-233, (1996).

[10] Zhang, Y.: Rigidity and holomorphic Segre transversality for holomorphic Segre maps. *Math. Ann.*, **337**, 457-478, (2007).

Department of Mathematics, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0112, USA

E-mail address: `angle@metsci.com`